# Metrowest Elementary School



**2023-24**

**Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)**

## Table of Contents

## Metrowest Elementary

### 1801 LAKE VILMA DR, Orlando, FL 32835

### https://metrowestes.ocps.net/

### SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

| Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI) |
| --- |
| A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%. |

| Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI) |
| --- |
| A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years. |

| Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) |
| --- |
| A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:<br><br>1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;<br>2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;<br>3. Have a school grade of D or F; or<br>4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years. |

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

| SIP Sections | Title I Schoolwide Program | Charter Schools |
|---|---|---|
| I-A: School Mission/Vision | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1) |
| I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring | ESSA 1114(b)(2-3) | |
| I-E: Early Warning System | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III) | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2) |
| II-A-C: Data Review | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2) |
| II-F: Progress Monitoring | ESSA 1114(b)(3) | |
| III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection | ESSA 1114(b)(6) | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4) |
| III-B: Area(s) of Focus | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii) | |
| III-C: Other SI Priorities | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9) |
| VI: Title I Requirements | ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g) | |

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

**Purpose and Outline of the SIP**

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

# I. School Information

## School Mission and Vision

**Provide the school's mission statement.**

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

With the support of families and the community, we create enriching and diverse pathways that lead our students to success.

## School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

### School Leadership Team
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|---|---|---|
| Donaldson, Sherry | Principal | *Creates an environment based on the professional code of ethics and values.<br>* Responds to all stakeholders in a timely, accurate, courteous, and in an empathetic manner.<br>* Maintains a safe, healthy, and inclusive learning and working environment.<br>* Manages all operations and functions of the school consistent with the district's mission and vision.<br>* Develops and administers policies that provide a safe and effective learning environment.<br>* Develops and monitors dedicated and high-quality teams.<br>* Visible in the school community and recognized as the instructional leader.<br>* Uses a variety of problem-solving techniques and decision-making skills to resolve problems.<br>* Communicates and interacts effectively with all stakeholders in the community.<br>* Follows the district's policies and procedures, the district's instructional initiatives, and the school district's guidelines.<br>* Follows the district's policies and procedures as related to fixed assets.<br>* Develops leadership skills in others<br>* Responsible for keeping current on technology being used by OCPS.<br>*Attends training to ensure skill level in various technologies is at the level required to perform in current position.<br>* Responsible for maintaining timely and accurate information and accountable for the quality of information maintained by those they supervise.<br>* Responsible for self-development and keeping current on research, trends, and evidence-based practices relevant to the area of responsibility.<br>* Perform other duties and responsibilities as assigned by the supervisor.<br>*Deliver high-quality education by maximizing resources to support school needs |
| Delgado, Chamaris | Instructional Coach | *Conducts observations and provides appropriate coaching, modeling, and feedback on the implementation of instruction that meets school and district-wide expectations<br>* Supports instructional staff with the gathering, examination, and analysis of formative and summative assessment data to identify learning concerns for individual students and groups of students through Professional Learning Communities<br>* Provides instructional support that is responsive to the identified needs of students and teachers<br>* Attends district professional development on related curriculum or instructional strategies<br>* Assists in providing professional development for instructional staff to meet the needs of the students and build capacity in our teachers<br>* Keeps current on researched-based instructional strategies and best practices with an emphasis on student engagement and learning<br>* Provides interventions for students performing below grade-level expectations |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------|----------------|----------------------------------|
| | | * Leads new teacher and new to Metrowest Elementary onboarding and mentoring program |
| McGhee, Adriane | Curriculum Resource Teacher | *Ensures and manages all testing from the state, district, and school levels<br>* Supports teachers in managing data using a school-wide monitoring system<br>*Conducts observations and provides appropriate coaching, modeling, and feedback on the implementation of instruction that meets school and district-wide expectations<br>* Supports instructional staff with the gathering, examination, and analysis of formative and summative<br>assessment data to identify learning concerns for individual students and groups of students through Professional Learning Communities<br>* Provides instructional support that is responsive to the identified needs of students<br>* Attends district professional development on related curriculum or instructional strategies<br>* Assists in providing professional development for instructional staff to meet the needs of the students and build capacity in our teachers<br>* Keeps current on researched-based instructional strategies and best practices with an emphasis on student engagement and learning<br>* Provides interventions for students performing below grade-level expectations<br>* Supports 3rd-5th grades with Math instruction |
| Conley, Joyce | Assistant Principal | *Demonstrates qualities of the professional code of ethics and values<br>* Respond to all stakeholders in a timely, accurate, courteous, and empathetic manner<br>* Models the routine, intentional, and effective use of technology in daily work, including communications, organization, and management tasks<br>* As delegated by the principal, manages the daily operations and functions of the school consistent with district policy and district priorities<br>* Administers and monitors policies that provide a safe and effective learning environment<br>* Communicates the school's vision, mission, and priorities to the community<br>* Serves as a member of the principal's leadership team and participates in the school's planning, development, and evaluation<br>* Supervises and assesses teachers and staff in terms of their performance and responsibilities in the achievement of school goals and district priorities<br>* Pursues improvement of personal and professional development<br>* Models the routine, intentional, and effective use of technology in daily work, including communications, organization, and management tasks<br>* In the absence of the principal, assumes responsibility for the total operation of the<br>school and the welfare of the teachers, staff, and students<br>* Responsible for keeping current on technology being used by Orange County Public Schools<br>* Responsible for maintaining timely and accurate information and |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------|----------------|--------------------------------|
| | | accountable for the quality of information maintained by those they supervise<br>* Responsible for self-development and keeping up to date on current research, trends, and evidence-based practices relevant to the area of responsibility<br>* Monitors student achievement and progress monitoring for assigned grade levels<br>* Participates in regular Professional Learning Communities |
| Ventura, Christine | Attendance/ Social Work | *Serves as one of the four required members of the School-Based Threat Management Team as the mental health professional in accordance with the OCPS School Threat Assessment Team Guide.<br>* Provides support for Threat to Other<br>* Facilitates process for threats to self according to the Threat Response Flowchart, ensure documentation (Threat Response on SharePoint through 12/2023 and EdPlan beginning 1/2024, State Portal for Involuntary Examination, and mental health cumulative folder)<br>* Ensures implementation of re-entry meetings for students following involuntary examination and collaborates to provide ongoing monitoring of student supports<br>* Primary Mental Health Designee Member Responsibilities<br>* Coordinates regular meetings with the Student Service team to support all tiers of mental health support and Resiliency initiatives<br>* Ensures collaborative systems are in place at school to identify students in need of services or supports and to provide, track, and monitor referrals for services (ex. SEDNET, DMHC)<br>* Provides timely documentation through district tracking and accountability systems (digital and cumulative folder)<br>• Primary Counselor Responsibilities<br>* Coordinates the state-mandated 5 hours of required Resiliency instruction<br>* Conducts whole class guidance curriculum lessons<br>* Conducts Social Skills Groups<br>* Conducts Individual Counseling Sessions<br>* Conducts Check in and Check out system with students<br>* Coordinates the logistics for Child Safety Matters lessons (permissions, scheduling dates/locations, obtaining materials, etc.).<br>* Meets with and counsels underperforming students to implement strategies for success<br>* Assists with student schedule students based on academic progressions<br>* Serves as school contact for MVP and foster care<br>* Provides direct individual and group counseling services<br>* Provides timely documentation through district tracking and accountability systems (digital and cumulative folder)<br>* Supports crisis response |

**Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development**
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The process involved stakeholders in collaboration during the Leadership, staff, and SAC meetings. The plan was reviewed with our School Advisory Council and input was gathered in July/August and September of 2023. The stakeholders included were administration, teachers, parents, and one of our businesses. Staff and the leadership team also provided input during August and September 2023 during preplanning, leadership meetings, and staff meetings.

**SIP Monitoring**
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be monitored monthly based on data for each area and aligned targeted goals. A progression report will be generated to discuss the SIP concerning these goals during the staff and parent meetings. In addition, regular monitoring will be done using daily classroom walkthroughs with weekly feedback and collaboration with staff, daily student progress monitoring, and weekly common planning with collaboration and feedback. Data will be shared weekly through a multi-tiered intervention process, exceptional education support, English Language Learner support, and after-school intervention programs. The leadership team will meet weekly to review the School improvement goals.

| **Demographic Data** Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024 | |
|---|---|
| **2023-24 Status** (per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served** (per MSID File) | Elementary School PK-5 |
| **Primary Service Type** (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2022-23 Title I School Status** | No |
| **2022-23 Minority Rate** | 85% |
| **2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** | 88% |
| **Charter School** | No |
| **RAISE School** | Yes |
| **ESSA Identification** *updated as of 3/11/2024 | TSI |
| **Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)** | No |
| **2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented** (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) |

| | Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) |
|---|---|
| **School Grades History** *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. | 2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C |
| **School Improvement Rating History** | |
| **DJJ Accountability Rating History** | |

## Early Warning Systems

**Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 7 | 24 | 32 | 42 | 35 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 163 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 28 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 71 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 22 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 |

**Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 1 | 9 | 13 | 29 | 33 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 113 |

**Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 1 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

### Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

**The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 2 | 30 | 37 | 45 | 13 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 144 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 20 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 59 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 17 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 62 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

**The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 3 | 14 | 16 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55 |

**The number of students identified retained:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

### Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

**The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 2 | 30 | 37 | 45 | 13 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 144 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 20 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 59 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 17 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 62 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

**The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 3 | 14 | 16 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55 |

**The number of students identified retained:**

| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | **Grade Level** | | | | | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

## II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

**ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)**
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

**On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.**

| Accountability Component | 2023 | | | 2022 | | | 2021 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement* | 48 | 57 | 53 | 46 | 56 | 56 | 40 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 55 | | | 53 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 41 | | | 83 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 44 | 60 | 59 | 48 | 46 | 50 | 41 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 56 | | | 43 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 54 | | | 40 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 49 | 63 | 54 | 44 | 61 | 59 | 36 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | | | | | 66 | 64 | | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | | | | | 51 | 52 | | | |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | 55 | 50 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | | | | | 80 | | | |
| ELP Progress | 69 | 59 | 59 | 77 | | | 46 | | |

*\* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.*

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

**ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)**

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|---|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | TSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 52 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 260 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 5 |
| Percent Tested | 99 |
| Graduation Rate | |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|---|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | TSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 53 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 421 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 99 |
| Graduation Rate | |

## ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

| 2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| SWD | 11 | Yes | 4 | 4 |
| ELL | 54 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | 67 | | | |
| BLK | 46 | | | |
| HSP | 53 | | | |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 62 | | | |

| 2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| FRL | 45 | | | |

| 2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| SWD | 28 | Yes | 3 | 3 |
| ELL | 62 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | 69 | | | |
| BLK | 37 | Yes | 1 | |
| HSP | 62 | | | |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 67 | | | |
| FRL | 45 | | | |

## Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

| 2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2021-22 | C & C Accel 2021-22 | ELP Progress |
| All Students | 48 | | | 44 | | | 49 | | | | | 69 |
| SWD | 15 | | | 8 | | | | | | | 3 | |
| ELL | 52 | | | 45 | | | 53 | | | | 5 | 69 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 50 | | | 83 | | | | | | | 2 | |
| BLK | 46 | | | 38 | | | 40 | | | | 5 | 58 |
| HSP | 46 | | | 43 | | | 61 | | | | 5 | 69 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| 2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2021-22 | C & C Accel 2021-22 | ELP Progress |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 59 | | | 47 | | | | | | | 4 | 77 |
| FRL | 44 | | | 34 | | | 42 | | | | 5 | 66 |

| 2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2020-21 | C & C Accel 2020-21 | ELP Progress |
| All Students | 46 | 55 | 41 | 48 | 56 | 54 | 44 | | | | | 77 |
| SWD | 9 | 33 | 36 | 17 | 32 | 45 | 22 | | | | | |
| ELL | 48 | 68 | 58 | 48 | 63 | 69 | 62 | | | | | 77 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 55 | | | 82 | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 37 | 43 | 33 | 40 | 47 | 38 | 23 | | | | | |
| HSP | 53 | 63 | 50 | 48 | 65 | 71 | 63 | | | | | 84 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 61 | 79 | | 62 | 55 | | 71 | | | | | 74 |
| FRL | 37 | 53 | 46 | 38 | 48 | 42 | 35 | | | | | 64 |

| 2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 | ELP Progress |
| All Students | 40 | 53 | 83 | 41 | 43 | 40 | 36 | | | | | 46 |
| SWD | 16 | 72 | | 20 | 33 | | | | | | | |
| ELL | 40 | 78 | | 43 | 45 | | 38 | | | | | 46 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 55 | | | 67 | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 30 | 34 | | 27 | 25 | 30 | 12 | | | | | |
| HSP | 46 | 70 | | 45 | 46 | | 43 | | | | | 51 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 59 | 67 | | 66 | 87 | | 64 | | | | | 48 |
| FRL | 29 | 38 | 70 | 35 | 34 | 10 | 31 | | | | | 38 |

**Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)**
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.
The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide
assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or
all tested students scoring the same.

| ELA | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 42% | 54% | -12% | 54% | -12% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 40% | 60% | -20% | 58% | -18% |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 41% | 52% | -11% | 50% | -9% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 42% | 59% | -17% | 59% | -17% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 41% | 62% | -21% | 61% | -20% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 34% | 55% | -21% | 55% | -21% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 38% | 59% | -21% | 51% | -13% |

## III. Planning for Improvement

**Data Analysis/Reflection**
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

**Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.**

The Statewide Science Assessment showed the lowest performance at 38% proficiency. Although the overall performance in Science remained the same from 2022, the Nature of Science strand showed the lowest performance with 5 out of 10 points for this area. The lack of hands-on experiences and learning opportunities contributed to the low performance and the level of academic vertical alignment of science standards, acquisition for proficiency, and acquisition of science vocabulary. The subgroup data for science proficiency included 10% for ELL students, 35% for Hispanic students, and 37% for Black students.

**Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.**

The greatest decline was in Math, decreasing from 48% (2022) to 39% (2023). The factors that contributed to the decline were teacher capacity with their lack of knowledge of the content, teacher retention, focused professional learning opportunities, hands-on learning, reading and comprehending text in mathematics, vertical alignment, and building background knowledge. The subgroup data for math proficiency included 8% for SWD students, 34% for Hispanic students, 40% for Black students, and 48% for White students.

**Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.**

When compared to the state average 58%) for ELA, the greatest gap was in 4th grade (40%) at -20%. The state average for 4th grade math was 61% compared to the school's average of 41%, which was a -21%, and the state average for 5th grade math at 55% compared to the school's average of 34%, which was at -21%. Additionally, the state average for Science was 51% compared to the school's average of 38%, which was -21%. The factors contributing to these gaps were consistent staffing to support students, small group and intervention instruction, instructional staff proficiency in teaching the standards, and a lack of hands-on experiences and learning opportunities aligned with the standards.

**Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?**

The data component that showed the most improvement was third grade ELA. In third grade ELA, there was an increase in overall proficiency from 36% in 2022 to 41% in 2023.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.**

One potential area of concern is student absences for 10% or more days. The total number of students absent for 10% or more days was 163. The breakdown by grade level included seven kindergarteners, 24 1st graders, 32 2nd graders, 42 3rd graders, 35 4th graders, and 23 5th graders. The second potential area of concern is 71 students scored a Level 1 on the ELA statewide assessment. The breakdown by grade level included 13 3rd graders, 28 4th graders, and 30 5th graders.

**Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.**

My highest priorities for the upcoming school year include:
1. Decreasing the gap compared to the state's average in math for ELA 4th grade from 40% to 50%. Decreasing the gap compared to the state's average in math for 4th grade from 41% to 50% and decreasing the gap for 5th grade math from 34% to 50%
2. Increasing Science proficiency for students in grade 5 on the statewide assessment from 38% to 50%
3. Increasing Math proficiency for grades 3-5 from 39% proficiency to 50% proficiency
4. Increasing 3rd grade proficiency from 41% to 50%
5. Decreasing the number of student absences in grades K-5

**Area of Focus**
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Our focus area is to increase teacher capacity in overall understanding of benchmarks, instructional best practices, and implementation of differentiated instruction. Focusing on this area with consistent progress monitoring from 2023 EOY to 2024 EOY will ultimately increase overall student achievement in ELA, Math, and Science. The rationale for selecting this focus is that teachers continue developing skills in best practices, content knowledge, and data monitoring. In addition, the use of differentiated instruction to support this understanding directly supports the needs of our lowest 25% and our subgroups. The subgroup data for science proficiency included 10% for ELL students, 35% for Hispanic students, and 37% for Black students. The subgroup data for math proficiency included 8% for SWD students, 34% for Hispanic students, 40% for Black students, and 48% for White students. The subgroup data for ELA proficiency included 15% for SWD, 35% for Hispanic students, 36% for ELL students, 45% for White students, and 49% for Black students.

**Measurable Outcome:**
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

The specific measurable outcome plans include (Level 3) for students in 3-5 grades in FAST ELA from 41% to 50, FAST Math from 39% to 50%, and Science from 38% to 50%. The outcome for SWD for FAST ELA will increase from 15% to 25%, ELL students from 36 to 46%, Black students from 49% to 59%, Hispanic students from 35% to 45%, and White students from 45% to 55%. The outcome SWD for FAST Math will increase from 8% to 20%, Hispanic students from 34% to 50%, ELL students from 37% to 50%, Black students from 40% to 50%, and White students from 48% to 58%. For Science, Hispanic students will increase from 34% to 50%, ELL students from 37% to 50%, Black students from 40% to 50%, and White students from 48% to 58%.

**Monitoring:**
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Leadership Team (Conley-K-2 and all subgroups, Delgado-ELA, Mcghee-Lowest 25% in ELA and Math, Jagarnath-Math, Donaldson-all areas, and Science) will monitor student data, attend and support PLCs and conduct data chats with teachers, students, and parents as needed. Leadership will also monitor differentiated instruction during classroom walks and target specific feedback and support, including SWD, ESE, and ELL support for teachers and students.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Sherry Donaldson (sherry.donaldson@ocps.net)

**Evidence-based Intervention:**
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The evidence-based interventions implemented for science in grades K-5 are hands-on opportunities, utilizing reading strategies within an informational text across content areas, access to and rotations in the Science lab, district support, and increasing teacher content knowledge of the standards.

For math intervention, we follow the district K-5 Instructional framework. Students will utilize hands-on opportunities, reading strategies within the math content, increasing vocabulary in context, intervention groups, afterschool tutoring, and small group instruction. We will use Successmaker, Reflex Math, and Number Worlds during small group centers and tutoring sessions. Professional development will be intentional to support in understanding the benchmarks and effective strategies during the intervention block with overall students and ELL and ESE support.

For reading intervention, we follow the district K-5 Instructional Framework, utilizing the resources SIPPS, Imagine Learning-for ELLs, Multisensory Kits, Being A Reader, RAZ Plus, Wonders Decodables, Wonders Leveled Readers, Heggerty, and the Scholastic Book Room.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The selected interventions are flexible and based on the needs of each student. Trend data and overall achievement data as well as teacher surveys indicate a continuous need for teacher development.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

**Action Steps to Implement**
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Meet with grade-level teams to discuss overall data from 2022-2023 school year.
Meet with SAC and community members to develop insights and plan for support for the school year.

**Person Responsible:** Sherry Donaldson (sherry.donaldson@ocps.net)

**By When:** August/September 2023

Create a professional development calendar on the use of manipulatives, scaffolding, and strategies to support differentiation in each area and for our ELL, Hispanic, and SWD subgroups. Develop a plan of support utilizing coaches and resource staff for Tier 2 and Tier 3 teachers and students. Include in this plan, direct and co-teaching, coaching cycles, and peer observations.

**Person Responsible:** Sherry Donaldson (sherry.donaldson@ocps.net)

**By When:** September/October 2023

Complete walkthroughs to monitor the implementation of differentiation in reading and math during the 120 minute reading block, math block, and intervention blocks.
Identify trends to support and guide Professional Learning.
Include understanding of district intervention resources as a part of the PLC agendaInclude data discussions during PLCs.

**Person Responsible:** Sherry Donaldson (sherry.donaldson@ocps.net)

**By When:** October 2023 to May 2024

## #2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment

### Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

The rationale for selecting teacher retention and recruitment as a crucial need is the fact that many teachers left the school in 2022-2023 and the difficulty in filling positions for the current year.

### Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

The specific measurable outcome we plan to see is the retention of teachers and the recruitment of new teachers for 2023-2024. Consequently, 18 out of 44 (41%) instructional staff left the school at the end of 2022-2023, including several instructional throughout the school year, which resulted in staff replacements for those positions. The goal is to reduce the number of instructional staff leaving the school to less than 5 (11%) for the 2023-2024 school year.

### Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

This area will be monitored for the desired outcome by understanding the Panorama survey from the previous year. Also, school-based surveys will be created and sent out every nine weeks to get a pulse of the attitudes, the perceptions of staff, and staff engagement. The Panorama survey will also be monitored for feedback.

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sherry Donaldson (sherry.donaldson@ocps.net)

### Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The evidence-based intervention being implemented for promoting a positive culture and environment includes staff engagement strategies. These strategies are foundational to the well-being and commitment of staff to our overall goals and their commitment to remain at our school and to encourage new staff members to join our team. The staff engagement strategies include the following: monthly teambuilding, instructional coaching, celebrating staff weekly on the morning announcements and in the staff newsletter, celebrating teacher/class goals relative to student achievement, celebrating staff daily attendance every nine weeks, providing opportunities for teacher leader development through model classroom visits, providing teacher leaders the opportunity to present professional learning, and providing professional growth opportunities.

### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for selecting these strategies includes Panorama Survey results for staff (2022-2023). The insight from the survey found that coaching and feedback was an area of concern at 35% which was an 11-point decrease from the previous survey. The concern of adequate resources was 19% which was a 9-point decrease from the previous year. There was also concern with School Leadership which was 40% with a decrease of 3-points.

### Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

### Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Complete an initial survey (Staff Engagement Survey)
Teambuilding activity
Opportunities for input and collaboration during common planning
Instructional coaching


**Person Responsible:** Sherry Donaldson (sherry.donaldson@ocps.net)

**By When:** August 2023

Teambuilding
instructional coaching
Opportunities for input and collaboration during common planning
Celebrating staff weekly on the morning announcements and in the staff newsletter
Celebrating teacher/class goals relative to student achievement
Providing opportunities for teacher leader development through model classroom visits
Providing teacher leaders the opportunity to present professional learning Providing professional growth
opportunities.

**Person Responsible:** Sherry Donaldson (sherry.donaldson@ocps.net)

**By When:** September 2023

Celebrating staff daily attendance every nine weeks
Teambuilding
instructional coaching
Opportunities for input and collaboration during common planning
Celebrating staff weekly on the morning announcements and in the staff newsletter
Celebrating teacher/class goals relative to student achievement
Providing opportunities for teacher leader development through model classroom visits
Providing teacher leaders the opportunity to present professional learning Providing professional growth
opportunities.

**Person Responsible:** Sherry Donaldson (sherry.donaldson@ocps.net)

**By When:** October -December 2023

Collect survey data from school-based and Panorama surveys
Teambuilding
instructional coaching
Opportunities for input and collaboration during common planning
Celebrating staff weekly on the morning announcements and in the staff newsletter
Celebrating teacher/class goals relative to student achievement
Providing opportunities for teacher leader development through model classroom visits
Providing teacher leaders the opportunity to present professional learning Providing professional growth
opportunities.

**Person Responsible:** Sherry Donaldson (sherry.donaldson@ocps.net)

**By When:** December 2023 and January 2024

Teambuilding
instructional coaching
Opportunities for input and collaboration during common planning
Celebrating staff weekly on the morning announcements and in the staff newsletter
Celebrating teacher/class goals relative to student achievement

Providing opportunities for teacher leader development through model classroom visits
Providing teacher leaders the opportunity to present professional learning Providing professional growth opportunities.
Opportunities for input and collaboration during common planning

**Person Responsible:** Sherry Donaldson (sherry.donaldson@ocps.net)

**By When:** February/March 2024

Teambuilding
instructional coaching
Opportunities for input and collaboration during common planning
Celebrating staff weekly on the morning announcements and in the staff newsletter
Celebrating teacher/class goals relative to student achievement
Providing opportunities for teacher leader development through model classroom visits
Providing teacher leaders the opportunity to present professional learning Providing professional growth opportunities
Opportunities for input and collaboration during common planning
End of the year survey
Calculate the number and percent of staff retained

**Person Responsible:** Sherry Donaldson (sherry.donaldson@ocps.net)

**By When:** April-June 2024

*No description entered*

**Person Responsible:** [no one identified]

**By When:**

## CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Our ongoing process to review school improvement funding allocations is driven by student performance. We utilize resources to fund after school tutoring and the implementation of intervention materials such as Exact Path, SIPPS, and science materials.

## Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale**
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- ◦ The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- ◦ The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- ◦ Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

**Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA**

With 57% of Kindergarten through 2nd grade students below proficiency based on the EOY FAST ELA (2023) and 52% (2023) of Kindergarten through 2nd grade students below proficiency based on STAR Early Literacy, students in Kindergarten and 1st grades will need to continue to focus on beginning phonics and/or
phonemic awareness. Second-grade students will need to continue to focus on small group instruction focusing on foundational skills, building vocabulary, and non-fiction comprehension.
Recommendation 1: Include Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding Kindergarten to 3rd Grade
Recommendation 2: Develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters
Recommendation 3: Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words

**Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically related to Reading/ELA**

The percentage of students below level 3 on the 2023 ELA schoolwide in 3rd is 59%, 4th is 60%, and 5th is 57%. Based on FAST data, students performing at Level 1 are just beginning to access the content standards. In 3rd grade, 42% of students scored a Level 1.
For Grade 3: Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding Kindergarten Through 3rd Grade skills
Recommendation 2: Develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they
link to letters.
Recommendation 3: Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and
recognize words. Build students' decoding skills so they can read complex multisyllabic
words. Increase vocabulary capacity for students.
In grade 4, 39% of students scored at Level 1; in 5th, 40% scored at Level 1.
For Grade 4-5,
Recommendation 1: Provide reading Interventions for students in grades 4-5, including the foundational skills to support reading for understanding and teaching students to develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters.
Recommendation 2: Build students' decoding skills so they can read complex multi-syllabic
words.
Recommendation: Increase vocabulary capacity for students.

**Measurable Outcomes**
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

### Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

Based on last year's average EOY FAST ELA proficiency our goals are as follows:
K-2 will move from 57% below proficiency to 40% below proficiency in EOY FAST ELA and 40% below proficiency in Early Literacy. The goal is to move students in K-2 from 43% proficiency to 60% proficiency in EOY FAST ELA (2024).

### Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

The specific measurable outcome for each grade level includes the following:
In 3rd grade, 59% of students were below Level 3 in 2023. The goal is to move from 59% to 48% below Level 3.
In 4th grade, 60% of students were below Level 3 in 2023. The goal is to move from 60% to 50% below Level 3.
In 5th grade, 57% of students were below Level 3 in 2023. The goal is to move from 57% to 47% below Level 3.

## Monitoring

### Monitoring
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

The school's Areas of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes by conducting weekly walkthroughs during the ELA block by administrators and coaches. Monthly data meetings will be conducted to include the MTSS Problem-Solving Teams in conjunction with instructional walks to review FAST progress monitoring assessments and district-created standard based unit assessments to monitor response to intervention.

### Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Donaldson, Sherry, sherry.donaldson@ocps.net

## Evidence-based Practices/Programs

**Description:**
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

The programs selected are researched and evidence-based reading instructional and intervention programs, SIPPS and Heggerty, that incorporate explicit, systematic, and sequential approaches to teaching phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency, and text comprehension and incorporate decodable or phonetic text instructional strategies. Reading intervention includes evidence-based strategies frequently used to remediate reading deficiencies and include, but are not limited to, individual instruction, multi-sensory approaches, tutoring, mentoring, or the use of technology that targets specific reading skills and abilities.

**Rationale:**
Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The rationale for selecting these programs and practices is the use of Heggerty to develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters and SIPPS to teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words and to build students' decoding skills so they can read complex multisyllabic words.

**Action Steps to Implement**
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership

- Literacy Coaching

- Assessment

- Professional Learning

| Action Step | Person Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---|
| Intervention groups will be formed based on student deficiencies determined by a district-approved diagnostic program developed to identify students' specific needs. | Delgado, Chamaris, chamaris.delgadobaerga@ocps.net |
| Teachers and leadership team members will attend professional development for maximizing the use of intervention and enrichment materials during small group and extra hour instructional time. | Delgado, Chamaris, chamaris.delgadobaerga@ocps.net |
| Teachers will plan and implement differentiated, small group instruction based on multiple<br>sources of data and track student progress toward proficiency. | Delgado, Chamaris, chamaris.delgadobaerga@ocps.net |

## Budget to Support Areas of Focus

**Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus**

**The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.**

| 1 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation | $0.00 |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment | $0.00 |
| | | Total: | $0.00 |

**Budget Approval**

**Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.**

No